REMARKS

Claims 81-91 and 103-105 remain pending and new claims 106 and 107 have been added. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the following remarks. No new matter has been added.

Claims 81 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bronson (USPN: 5,305,435). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 81 generally relates to a technique in which an image containing information is introduced into a display window, for example a virtual device, so as to create an appearance that the introduced image is sliding into the display window, and removing an image containing information from the display window so as to create the appearance that the removed image is sliding out of the display window. As the applicants explain at page 12 of the application, this technique advantageously "maintains a feeling that the virtual device is a single instrument, not a plurality of individual windows of the type normally found on windows based computers."

Nothing in Bronson teaches or describes the claimed methods. Bronson describes a computer display interface which simulates document handling activities based on a metaphor representative of a standard office filing system and work area of a desk (Abstract). The disclosed system "makes use of a window identification display about the periphery of a screen, leaving the central screen area clear of non-active windows." (3:18-21). The result is a "virtual filing system" which is "created along the screen edges which simulates a standard office fling system. By virtual it is meant that the inactive windows cannot be seen, but since the windows appear to slide on and off the screen, one gets the sense that the non-displayed windows are just off the sides of the screen waiting to be pulled back into view." (3:60-66). Thus while Bronson teaches that windows may be made to slide on and off of a display screen, nothing in Bronson teaches or suggests introducing an image containing information into a display window so as to create an appearance that the introduced image is sliding into the display window. Similarly, nothing in Bronson teaches or suggests removing an image containing information from the display window so as to create an appearance that the removed image is sliding out of the display window.

Applicant : Al-Riaz Adatia et al.
Serial No. : 09/593,877
Filed : June 14, 2000
Page : 23 of 26

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-498001

For at least the foregoing reasons, Bronson does not anticipate claim 81.

Claims 82-85 and 87 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Bronson in view of MacKay (USPN: 5,307,456). For the following reasons, this rejection is traversed.

As best understood, the Examiner appears to assert that Bronson teaches introducing and removing images containing menu items into and out of a display window by sliding, and that MacKay further teaches using such menu items in a media player. However, as noted above, the Examiner's initial premise is incorrect. Bronson does not teach introducing and removing images containing menu items into and out of a display window by sliding. Rather, Bronson teaches introducing and removing images onto and off of a screen by sliding. Nothing in Bronson teaches or suggests introducing or removing an image item containing a menu relating to the operation of a media player into and out of a display window by sliding as taught and claimed in the present application.

For at least this reason, the combination of Bronson and MacKay fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 82. Because claims 83-85 and 87 all depend from claim 82, the combination of Bronson and MacKay also fail to teach or suggest the limitations in these claims as well.

Claim 86 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Bronson in view of MacKay and in further view of Ludolph et al. (USPN: 6,239,798). The examiner's reasoning is based on the assertion that Bronson-MacKay discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. However as previously discussed, Bronson-MacKay fails to teach the invention substantially as claimed because it fails to teach introducing or removing an image item containing a menu relating to the operation of a media player into and out of a display window by sliding. For at least this reason, claim 86 is patentable over Bronson in view of MacKay and in further view of Ludolph et al.

Claims 88 and 103-105 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Bronson in view of MacKay. Independent claim 88 (from which claims 103-105 depend) recites a method of providing visual effects for a media player running under a window based operating system including displaying, in a single window of the window-based operating system, a user interface

Applicant : Al-Riaz Adatia et al.
Serial No. : 09/593,877
Filed : June 14, 2000
Page : 24 of 26

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-498001

region with a display window integrated into the user interface region and displaying on the display window visual effects corresponding to material being played on the media player. Thus these claims relate to techniques for displaying visual effects corresponding to material being played in a media player.

As best understood, the Examiner argues that Bronson discloses the limitations of claim 88 except that Bronson does not disclose the limitation of providing visual effects for a media player corresponding to material being played on the media player. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious "to include Mackay's providing visual effects for a media player corresponding to material being played on the media player into that of Bronson invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing multi-media producer work to any end user."

However careful review of Bronson and Mackay show that they fail to teach the combination of claim 88 as amended. As noted above, Bronson describes a computer display interface which simulates document handling activities based on a metaphor representative of a standard office filing system and work area of a desk (Abstract). Bronson discloses that the computer display interface includes plural windows, these windows may "represent either application programs or data files." (5:42-3). These windows may be dragged off of the screen, at which point they are converted to tabs at the edge of the screen, which may be activated to pull the windows back onto the screen. (e.g., 6:12-36; 7:23-35). Thus Bronson does not disclose at least (1) a media player, (2) displaying in a single window of a windows-based operating system, a user interface region within a display window integrated into the user interface region, the user interface region including controls for controlling the display of material being displayed on the media player; or (3) displaying in the display window visual effects corresponding to material being played on the media player.

Nothing in Mackay teaches or suggests modifying Bronson to add these claimed features. First, there is nothing in Mackay that would suggest modifying or combining with Bronson in any way. Unlike Bronson, which teaches a graphical user interface for a filing system using a desktop metaphor, Mackay teaches a multi-media production and authoring system having a

Applicant : Al-Riaz Adatia et al.
Serial No. : 09/593,877
Filed : June 14, 2000
Page : 25 of 26

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-498001

real-time network called "AV LAN" which provides to a user at a workstation shared access to multiple multi-media production resource devices (abstract). Thus Mackay teaches a network apparatus for enabling a user at a workstation to enable multiple editing resources. Nothing in Mackay teaches or suggests modifying a desktop file system GUI such as disclosed in Bronson in any way.

Moreover, nothing in Mackay teaches or suggests displaying, in a single window, a user interface region within a display window integrated into the user interface region, the user interface region including controls for controlling the display of material being displayed on the media player. While Mackay describes a graphical user interface for a multi-media editing system, e.g. in Figures 27-30, it is notable that in this user interface, the controls for controlling the display of multi-media are not included within specific windows, but are part of a conventional menu-type control system in which menu items (e.g., 982, 994 and 1006) external to the display windows (e.g., 1030, 1032-1042) are used to control the display of multi-media information. Thus, rather than teaching a window having a user interface region having for controlling the display of material in a media player, MacKay actually teaches away from it, by teaching that controls should be separated from display windows.

For at least these reasons, claims 88 as amended, and claims 103-105, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 91 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Bronson in view of MacKay and in further view of Ludolph et al. (USPN: 6,239,798). The examiner's reasoning is based on the assertion that Bronson-MacKay discloses the invention substantially as claimed in claim 88. However as previously discussed, Bronson-MacKay fails to teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 88. For at least this reason, claim 91 is patentable over Bronson in view of MacKay and in further view of Ludolph et al.

New claims 106-107 have been added. These claims depend from directly or indirectly from claim and are patentable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 81.

Applicant : Al-Riaz Adatia et al.
Serial No. : 09/593,877
Filed : June 14, 2000
Page : 26 of 26

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-498001

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050 and reference 10984-498001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/14/03

Lawrence K. Kolodney
Reg. No. 43,807

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20708802.doc